

object to it; it was an error in the legislation.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday and again on Friday I may address the House for 20 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered for the respective days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain extraneous matter.)

EX-CONVICT ED RUMELY, THE SELF-APPOINTED MINISTER OF PROPAGANDA, KEEPS REPUBLICAN LEADER IN LINE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand three tremendously interesting clippings from the Republican newspapers in the city of Providence, R. I.

The first clipping is from the Evening Bulletin dated Friday, September 1—3 days after I delivered a speech revealing once again the subversive activities of the ex-convict, Edward A. Rumely, and his committee for a Fascist government in the United States, alias Committee for Constitutional Government.

On page 1 of the Providence Evening Bulletin is this headline: "Dresser answers PATMAN attack on Rumely, self." To the credit of the Evening Bulletin, a Republican newspaper, let me say that they published, along with Robert Dresser's statement, a fair account of what I said on August 29 concerning Mr. Dresser, one of Rumely's oberleutnants. I had documentary proof that Dresser was part and parcel of Rumely's gang. In the 2 weeks that followed, the Rhode Island press and radio kept commenting on my remarks and Dresser's defense of Rumely and himself. Then, on September 15, top of page 1, there appeared this article I hold in my hand, with the headline "Dresser resigns R. I. GOP finance committee post" and the subheadline "Says he believes his action is what Levy, senatorial candidate, desires."

Three days later, in the Providence Evening Bulletin, on page 1, is the third article, Levy-Dresser Differences Not Resolved. The article contains a most significant statement from Republican senatorial candidate Levy which I quote:

It is true that Mr. Dresser and I hold opposite views on fundamental matters of importance. In addition, there are differences of opinion as to how the campaign should be organized and conducted. I am concerned that these differences have not been relieved since Mr. Dresser published his letter of withdrawal.

I believe that there is room within the framework of the Republican Party for all active workers and patriotic Americans who are concerned for our country's future.

And then, continued the article:

While Levy declined to enlarge, his reply was interpreted in some measure as accentuating the clash between him and other Republicans of Dresser's beliefs concerning

what the party should stand for in the campaign.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks of August 29, I asked the question: Will the Republicans never turn their back on Ed Rumely and his ilk? I had questioned the strange kinship between the Republican Party and some of the principal owners and operators of that party with the proven Fascist, Edward A. Rumely, and his personal anti-American activities committee, alias the Committee for Constitutional Government. I had stated that Robert Dresser, prominent Providence, R. I., attorney, was part and parcel of Rumely's gang. I had also quoted in my remarks of the 29th a statement from the Providence Journal that Dresser admitted quoting in a letter to Guy Gabrielson, Republican National Chairman, from the writings of the long-time hatemonger, Joseph P. Kamp. Kamp, you will recall, was one of the pro-Nazis indicted by the Government for treason during World War II. Kamp, you will also recall, is in or just got out of jail for contempt of Congress, and on August 31 was cited again for contempt of Congress for failing to reveal the source of the money which enables him to carry on his nefarious activities. Dresser said in his statement:

I am proud to be classed as a friend of Joe Kamp and to quote from his excellent writings.

One of the clippings I hold in my hand quotes James H. Readia, Jr., chairman of the finance committee, who said that Dresser's withdrawal from the committee is a very real tragedy to the party in Rhode Island.

Readia said, according to the article, that no man in the party has been more instrumental in raising campaign funds.

Just think of that, this valuable Republican, Dresser, an oberleutnant of Ed Rumely, proud to quote from the long-time hatemonger, is a vital cog in the Republican machine in Rhode Island and nationally.

But Republican senatorial candidate Austin Levy cannot stomach all this. Here is a man, a Republican, who does turn his back on the Rumelys, the Dressers, and the Kamps. He does not want the Republican Party to become a Fascist party. He says:

I believe that there is room within the framework of the Republican Party for all active workers and all patriotic Americans who are concerned for our country's future.

Evidently, and quite accurately, he did not classify Rumely, Dresser, and Kamp among these. For his common sense and his patriotism, I, a Democrat, commend Austin Levy, the Republican.

But do we hear any statement from GOP Chairman Guy Gabrielson turning his back on such characters? From him there is an ominous, loud, and revealing silence.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, during the course of his remarks in the House on September 18, inserted in the Record a statement from Mr. Dresser which quoted from my remarks of August 29 concerning Edward Rumely, his committee, and his oberleutnant, Robert Dresser. Then, after these quotations lifted out of context,

the gentleman from Michigan says that they follow—

The usual pattern used by those with which Mr. PATMAN runs. In place of a discussion of the issues on their merits, it substitutes vilification and abuse. It is the familiar smear technique of the New Deal.

Significantly, the gentleman from Michigan is paraphrasing what Robert Dresser said about my statement.

The Providence Evening Bulletin of September 1 said that the Patman attack, according to Dresser, "omits all discussion of issues on their merits and confines itself to vilification and abuse. It is the familiar smear technique of the New Deal."

Now, of course, both of these statements imply that I made charges without backing them up. Consequently, in fairness to all, I shall now quote what Dresser left out of context from my remarks of August 29 and which the gentleman from Michigan inserted in the Record. At the same time, I shall also quote from my remarks of August 29 the supporting evidence.

EFFORTS TO PREVENT PEOPLE GETTING THE TRUTH

It is a curious fact that the day after I delivered my remarks concerning Rumely, Dresser, and the Committee for a Fascist Government in the United States it was impossible to buy a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A member of my staff tried to do so but to no avail.

We learned that Rumely's friends had been to work and gobbled them all up so that neither the press nor the American people would be able to learn what I had revealed. I therefore welcome the opportunity to reply to Mr. Dresser's statement as inserted in the Record by the gentleman from Michigan. My remarks had been lifted out of context. I only hope that the press this time will be able to get ahold of today's Record and then send out across the land what anti-American activities Rumely, Dresser, and their friends carry on.

And I hope the press will not be intimidated by Rumely's gang. There are no libel suits when you tell the truth.

Dresser's first quotation from my speech, as put in the Record of September 18 by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to warn the American people and the Congress of the United States about a man, an evil man, and an evil institution he directs. This man constitutes as grave a threat to the well-being and security of the United States as any Communist within our borders, yet he is no Communist.

He does use their tactics; for example, the constant repetition of the big lie. He defies the constitutional authority of the House of Representatives just as the Communists have consistently done. He is as fraudulent as they are. He is at least as arrogant. He wraps himself up in the cloak of our Constitution, and he assumes a super-duper patriotism. He pretends to be a defender of our freedom. Actually he would destroy it.

In years past I warned you about this man and his sinister purpose. I told you who Ed Rumely was. He was an American Fascist, plain and unadulterated, when I first revealed his un-American activities in 1944. Ed Rumely is the same plain, unadulterated native Fascist today and his committee for

a Fascist government in the United States, alias the Committee for Constitutional Government, is up to its old tricks of trying to fool all the people all the time on legislative matters of vital importance to the people of this Nation.

I shall now reinsert some portions of my speech which are pertinent to the aforementioned:

WHAT IS A FASCIST AND FASCISM?

Now, the word "Fascist," like the word "Communist," has been bandied about rather loosely in recent years. Ed Rumely and his crowd would call anyone a Communist who voted for any legislation designed to aid the general public. The Daily Worker would call anyone who disagreed with the Moscow party line a Fascist.

I will tell you precisely what I mean by Fascist and fascism, and in the course of my remarks you will learn that Ed Rumely and his extreme, reactionary committee fit the descriptions.

Just what is a Fascist? A Fascist is a man who is totally and absolutely antidemocratic. A Fascist is a man who in reality does not believe in the rights of man. A Fascist is a man who, ignoring all human rights, worships property rights and power. Such were the kind of men who put Hitler into power, and before Hitler, Mussolini.

Just what is fascism? The late, renowned Heywood Broun called it a "dictatorship from the extreme right, a government which is run by a small group of large industrialists and financial lords. The mere presence of the Supreme Court, a House of Representatives, a Senate, and a President would not be sufficient protection against the utter centralization of power in the hands of a few men who might hold no office at all."

Fascism cynically denies the ability of the people to govern themselves through their own chosen representatives. Under fascism, as under communism, the individual is a vassal of the state. Under fascism the rich get richer and the poor more downtrodden. Under fascism monopolies are handed over to the chosen few in the government hierarchy. Under fascism labor unions are used to suppress labor. Under fascism taxation is not based upon ability to pay; the tax load is thrown upon those least able to pay while the rich are encouraged to become wealthier. Under fascism any forward-looking legislation such as social security, soil conservation, veterans benefits, public housing, national health insurance—all such legislation is ridiculed and dubbed socialism or communism.

Under fascism, just as under communism, religions are ridiculed, because the individual would look to a higher power than the state. The state cannot tolerate people looking to any power higher than itself.

Gentlemen, practically every piece of propaganda turned out the past decade or more—running into tens of millions of copies of speeches, articles, and statements—from Ed Rumely's phony constitutional committee has been saturated with the obnoxious odor of fascist bias. This propaganda, if we examine a single item, would not necessarily prove fascist, but when you add all of the material together, you cannot escape the fact that what Ed Rumely and his committee are trying to perpetrate upon the American people is a violently reactionary government, which adds up to the Fascist state.

Let me repeat that: A single item from Ed Rumely's propaganda machine may or may not be fascist, but through the years, adding all the component parts, he and his committee spell but one thing for America: fascism.

Now, regarding my remarks about Rumely being the disseminator of the

big lie, let us see what I said on the subject which Dresser did not include in his statement inserted by Congressman HOFFMAN:

RUMELY, CCG, AND THE BIG-LIE TECHNIQUE

The big lie that Ed Rumely spews, hoping that by repeating it the people will come to believe it truth, is that everything that has happened in America since the advent of Franklin D. Roosevelt is socialistic and communistic, and he does not differentiate between new dealism, the Truman Fair Deal, socialism, or communism—this cruel untruth in spite of the fact that one major corporation in America last year made \$600,000,000 net after all taxes. Rumely would have the people believe that white is black and black is white. He tries to frighten people with scare words. He is against rheumatism, socialism, communism. Well, who is not?

But let us see what he means by socialism or communism. Ed Rumely and his committee, which consistently through the years has worked against the best interests of the people of the United States, have fought, when badly needed, all rent-control and low-rent and veterans' housing bills. Such measures he calls socialistic or communistic. He tried to do away with the income tax on high-bracket incomes.

"SOCIALISM—COMMUNISM"

He fought labor's magna carta, the Wagner Act, using the same scare words: "Socialism—communism." Rumely wants labor to believe that unions are against their own interests, that the Taft-Hartley law is the finest thing that ever happened to labor. He tries to make people who are benefited by the minimum-wage law believe that those who favor such legislation are plotting to undermine the country and make them unemployed. The minimum-wage law is dubbed socialistic or communistic.

And so, too, every other forward-looking measure part and parcel of the Roosevelt and Truman programs. Day in, day out, year in, year out, he seeks to divide the country, to make the farmer believe that anything that benefits labor will work against the farmer and vice versa. Those measures designed to help the people are socialistic or communistic, and those who espouse such measures are Socialists, Communists, or planners and fellow travelers.

Gentlemen, if this renegade, Rumely, had his way and could succeed in abolishing all of our social legislation passed since 1933 under Roosevelt and Truman, we would have complete anarchy in America. We would have what the Communists pray for—revolution in America.

The big lie is contained all through his propaganda, about which I said:

HOW A FASCIST PROPAGANDA MILL OPERATES

Millions of dollars have been collected by Rumely to run his propaganda mill. In 1944 his committee issued a pamphlet which contains the following statement:

"In mobilizing and educating public opinion on constitutional issues, the committee has sent out since 1937:

"Eighty-two million pieces of literature—booklets, pamphlets, reprints of editorials and articles, specially addressed letters, and 760,000 books.

"More than 10,000 transcriptions, carrying 15-minute radio talks on national issues, besides frequent national hook-ups for representatives of the committee.

"Three hundred and fifty thousand telegrams to citizens to arouse them to action on great issues.

"Many thousands of releases to daily and weekly newspapers."

Rumely's auditor reported that in 1943 26,456,636 pieces of literature were printed. In lobbying reports on file with the Clerk of

the House of Representatives, the Fascistic Committee for Constitutional Government lists the following expenditures:

1946-----	\$216,575.39
1947-----	460,908.11
1948-----	450,000.63
1949-----	620,632.07
First 6 months (1950)-----	517,580.19

I repeated that he was a disseminator of the big lie in the following words:

He is completely antidemocratic and anti-social. He would destroy America's freedom. He would make the rich richer; the poor poorer. He is the willing and paid agent of the most selfish and short-sighted wealthy individuals in America.

Dresser quoted me as follows:

I am speaking to you today, hoping that my remarks will somehow get back to those unthinking, irrational millionaire suckers who are counting upon Ed Rumely and his ilk to save their America. I hope these foolish men wise up and dry up their contributions.

The following, which Dresser failed to quote, is pertinent to the aforementioned. It will indicate who some of Rumely's millionaire backers are.

Now let me quote from a telegram signed by patriarch Lamont du Pont, one of the most unreconstructed Tories in America, who has not learned that, if you do not throw a bone to a hungry dog, the dog might bite you. Mr. du Pont is one of the principal donors to any and all reactionary causes, including the lost cause of the GOP. Wires Mr. du Pont to a host of big corporation executives:

"Last year we and other Delaware citizens helped finance America's future. * * * Treasury ruled gifts deductible. Please make your company's check payable America's Future, Inc., care of William J. Laird, Wilmington Trust Co."

America's Future is one of Ed Rumely's phony front organizations.

THE THIN ODOR OF FEW AND OTHERS

Mr. J. Howard Pew, one of the principal owners and operators of the Grand Old Party, who for nearly two decades has thrown vast sums away in 48 States and nationally for the lost cause of the GOP, also worked hard sending telegrams for Rumely's front organization, America's Future.

Now, let us take a look at the ex-convict's stationery for his Committee for Constitutional Government. Partial list of advisory board:

"Edward H. Moore, Tulsa, Okla.: Ed Moore was a one-term Republican Senator who thought that the Congress of the United States operated exclusively for millionaires.

"Frank E. Gannett, Rochester, N. Y.: This New York publisher ran for the Vice Presidential nomination several times. Even the old guard wing of the GOP could not stomach this Fascist-minded gentleman.

"Louis J. Taber, Columbus, Ohio: An alleged farm leader whose advice to farmers has long been that of a glassy-eyed banker. Taber was a Hoover farm adviser, and you remember what happened to the farmers under the administration of the great engineer.

"J. H. Gipson, Caldwell, Iowa: State director, Republican State Advisory Committee, in 1945.

"O. R. McGuire, Washington, D. C.: Was counsel for the National Association of Property Owners and Taxpayers, an arch-Republican outfit.

"Mrs. Henry Doorly, Omaha, Nebr.—Her husband owns and operates the Omaha World Herald that is so fiendishly Republican it frequently makes Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune look like a pro-administration newspaper by comparison."

And so on down the list it goes so far as Rumely's advisory board is concerned.

Now, it is a well-known fact that most upper-income people, particularly corporation heads and monopoly chieftains, are Republicans. Let me quote from a letter, signed by Rumely, written to a Member of Congress:

"Attached hereto a booklet, Suggestions, by Robert B. Dresser, one of our trustees, of which the first 60,000 are going into circulation currently. One of our trustees, Harvey Fruehauf, is sending 6,600 copies to his stockholders, writing them, urging them to speak up to Congress. He is also writing to corporation presidents urging them to distribute this to their stockholders."

"Last spring the trustees voted to begin a long-range program of education on the tax issue. A copy of the resolution is enclosed. We distributed several hundred thousand Would You Like To Double Your Income? last spring and arranged in selected districts to have friends of the committee enlist 20 to 30 leading individuals to write to their Representatives."

The Harvey Fruehauf mentioned above is the wealthy trailer manufacturer on Rumely's advisory board who spends a fortune on lost causes, including the GOP. I cited the afore-mentioned letter because it shows how stockholders are fooled by such moral deviates as Rumely and his venal henchmen. Now, let me quote from a letter written to Mr. Fruehauf on November 19, 1948, signed by Ed Rumely:

"As we are asking you to write to the 17,000 corporation presidents, we asked Ed Hutton to write to 20,000 individuals worth \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 and over. Copy of his letter is attached. * * *

"If you care to, you might say 'This committee is in no way political. If it were, I would not support it * * * but it does try to shield public officials regardless of party from the revenge tactics of the rulers of labor monopolies. It distributes to the public nonpartisan educational material on vital constitutional and free-enterprise issues that are under consideration.'

"I do hope that we can have on Monday your O. K., for your letter is the only good key that we have to open the door to the most important group that we must reach immediately."

Parenthetically, I shall add that Mr. Edward F. Hutton, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y., is the principal partner of E. F. Hutton & Co., one of the largest Wall Street brokerage houses. He also finances lost causes such as the GOP.

FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM GROUP

Now I want to quote from a long letter, dated October 7, 1949, from Ed Rumely to former Republican Senator Albert Hawkes, who at one time was president of the National Association of Manufacturers:

"Your telephone call was a source of great encouragement.

"A grass-roots organization across the Nation is a major job which the committee could not undertake except for its 12-year-long background. During this period we have accumulated a list of about 75,000 who have given financial support aggregating a total of \$5,500,000. Mainly, these same supporters have projected America's Future, contributing to it an additional \$1,000,000.

"During the last 8 months we have been carefully, step by step, preparing the Fighters for Freedom movement."

Dresser lifts out of context the following:

This cancer on the American body politic, Rumely, and the coterie of blind Tories that support him are sending out across the Nation a book written by a psychopath named John T. Flynn. The book, *The Road Ahead*, has been called by America, the liberal Catholic magazine, the road to nowhere. Flynn

proves in his book the big lie that Roosevelt, Truman, the Fair Deal, the New Deal, socialism, communism are indistinguishable.

The following from my August 29 speech is pertinent to the afore-mentioned:

RUMELY, CCG, JOHN T. FLYNN, AND THE "KINGDOM OF GOD" OFFEND PROTESTANTS

In this book Rumely distributes by the hundreds of thousands is a chapter called *The Kingdom of God*. I will quote from this chapter because I do not believe that the Republican Party wishes deliberately to offend the great mass of churchgoers in America. If they do not wish to do this, then the Republican Tories who keep Rumely going had better see that he at least eliminates part of chapter 10 before he mails it out so promiscuously and the Republicans endorse it so enthusiastically.

"There is an organization known as the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Its constituent members are 25 Protestant denominations in America. These denominations claim to represent 142,354 local congregations with a membership of 27,000,000 Christian men and women and youth. This organization is governed by about 450 representatives—delegates from the constituent denominations. But the actual directing body is an executive committee of 80 members.

"What the political and social views of these 80 members may be I do not know. But I do know that this powerful council issues periodicals, pamphlets, books, and booklets and sends out preachers to preach the gospel, and that it is by all odds the most powerful apparatus in existence for propaganda among the Christian laity of America. And I know, moreover, and assert, that many of the men most powerful in directing its affairs are using its machinery to promote the interests of a Socialist revolution in America."

A postal card soliciting bulk purchases of *The Road Ahead* says:

"If you and others help distribute to millions this eye-opening book, they will see the perils ahead and reverse our movement into socialism."

Mr. John T. Flynn must enjoy poking into hornets' nests—and his buddy, Ed Rumely, too—because right now the most important single Protestant church organization in America is after them for spreading such lying propaganda as I have just quoted.

In America it is an accepted practice for political demagogues and crack-brained authors to malign their Government. But when two of such like Ed Rumely and John T. Flynn malign the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, our greatest Protestant organization, they may have started something they had not reckoned with. They may have cast the rope that will hang both of them.

I call this to the attention of my esteemed Republican colleagues so that they will not be led to the same scaffold.

RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

Speaking as a Baptist, I would be guilty of religious intolerance were I to denounce the Catholic Church. There is no danger of my doing so. I detest bigots. I risked my life to vigorously oppose and condemn the KKK at a time when the Klan was riding high, but speaking as a Protestant, I resent the Catholic John T. Flynn's denouncing leading, world-renowned members of the Protestant church, and furthermore I condemn vigorously the distribution of such false propaganda in the Protestant homes and Protestant churches throughout the United States as contained in the book *The Road Ahead*.

Dresser's defense statement as inserted into the Record by the gentleman from

Michigan again lifts out of context the following:

You see, Rumely, the constitutional authority, was really interested in killing rent control and public housing to eliminate slums rather than in being what he claims to be, the great defender of American liberty and the Constitution. Dresser, bear in mind, is part and parcel of Rumely's gang.

The following from my August 29 remarks is pertinent to the above.

Ed Rumely wrote a letter to Mr. R. B. Dresser of Edward & Angel, 15 Westminster Street, Providence, R. I. I will not bother you with the full content of the letter. A few lines will certify the point that I wish to make. Mr. R. B. Dresser, incidentally, was a delegate to the 1944 and 1948 Republican Presidential conventions of milk-of-human-kindness ROBERT TAFT.

Wrote Ed Rumely to Dresser:

"The committee spent almost \$10,000 last June going back home to stir up support for killing the rent-control bill in committee. I did this on the urging of Chicago real-estate men."

Further on, Rumely complains to the Taft delegate:

"The real-estate people do not realize first that it takes money to fight a battle against union pressure with its vast treasures, and second that they cannot expect individual small contributors to put up the funds needed for an effective campaign. When rent control and public housing come up in Congress at least 500,000, or preferably 700,000 or 800,000, people should be reached with literature and as many as possible aroused to speak up."

Dresser's statement quoting my remarks of August 29, inserted in the Record by the gentleman from Michigan, contained the following:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Congressman DOYLE. Rumely is a plain fraud.

The afore-mentioned quote did not go on to say why I considered the man a fraud and why I agreed with Congressman DOYLE, of the House Lobby Investigating Committee. Rumely had contended before that committee that he was an educator and a publisher and, therefore, did not have to furnish records of those who put up the money for him to carry on his political propaganda mill. Here is the quote of Congressman DOYLE I used to show that Rumely is a fraud:

RUMELY THE FRAUD

Earlier in my remarks, I said that the former inmate of a United States jail, Ed Rumely, was a fraud. The subterfuges I have just presented to you show that I was not exaggerating. Here is some more proof.

Rumely says that his Committee for Constitutional Government is an "educational institution," and that he is really a publisher as well as an educator. My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from California, CLYDE DOYLE, a member of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, gave the lie to this one. Said the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE]:

"The Committee for Constitutional Government is one of the heaviest spending lobbying groups on record. It has reported spending over \$2,000,000 since the Lobbying Act went into effect, and yet has never revealed the identity of its big financial supporters.

"From time to time this organization has described itself as an ordinary commercial publisher. This lobbying organization dif-

fers from commercial publishers in many respects, some of which are:

"1. A commercial publisher takes the normal risks of operating a private business—he does not beg the public for money to help him carry on.

"2. A commercial publisher expects to pay income tax on his receipts—he does not seek tax exemption.

"3. A commercial publisher is in business for profit; he is not primarily an advocate. He does not constantly grind out pamphlets, leaflets, books, etc., which present only one side of the subject.

"4. A commercial publisher does not couple his publishing activities with incessant appeals to the citizenry to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress in order to influence legislation.

"The commercial publishers of the United States are not governed by the Federal Lobbying Act in any way, and need not file reports under it. They are not attempting to influence legislation; they are attempting to make money. They should not be confused by attempts of out-and-out lobbying organizations to conceal their activities from Congress and the public.

"The Committee for Constitutional Government has also attempted to liken itself to educational institutions; but it ignores the following facts:

"1. An educational institution does not spend millions of dollars in pamphleteering campaigns designed to influence congressional action on legislation.

"2. An educational institution does not engage in a constant campaign for funds to carry on lobbying activities.

"3. An educational institution does not couple its activities with incessant appeals to the citizenry to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress in order to influence legislation.

"4. An educational institution presents both sides of the question in an objective fashion for appraisal. It does not continually present only one viewpoint on each issue it considers.

"Considering all the afore-mentioned we can reach but one conclusion: Edward A. Rumely is not an educator. He is not a publisher."

As further proof that Rumely is a fraud, I also said, on August 29:

The Select Committee on Lobbying Activities discovered a subterfuge designed by Rumely's conniving brain to avoid revealing the source of large contributions from millionaires. The Committee for a Fascist Government, alias Committee for Constitutional Government, and its phony front organizations—such as Fighters for Freedom, America's Future, and the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation (note the patriotic names Rumely gives his enterprises)—print and distribute books, produce radio shows, and feed propaganda generally. Rumely, incidentally, gets a 4-percent commission (above \$16,000 sales) on every book sold.

By law, the names of all contributors of \$500 or more must be reported under the Lobbying Act. So Rumely calls money sent to him "contributions" only if it is less than \$490. These contributions are used to distribute Rumely's propaganda booklets and to pay for his office overhead. If you send in more than \$490, he will take it, but he will not call it a "contribution" even though you do. He uses it to finance the distribution of his books, just as he uses the small contributions, but this time he calls it a sale of books. He may or may not use it to pay office overhead, too. The Lobbying Committee could not find that out because he refused to give a constitutionally established committee of the United States Congress information that it was legally authorized to obtain.

Usually the purchaser of Rumely's "bunkum" does not know where the books, pamphlets, and other fascistic material are sent. Sometimes Rumely asks the mass purchaser to signify what schools and universities he would like to saturate with his poison. Very often the sucker complies.

The sale of books and literature operation has another purpose to the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government besides hiding the identity of its financial backers. It has been used as an inducement for individuals and corporations to supply the CCG with funds on the basis of a tax benefit to the purchaser—donor. The 1944 leaflet soliciting book purchases and direct contributions contains this statement:

"It is legal for corporation funds to be expended for the purchase of literature to educate employees, or the public, as to necessity for preserving those constitutional principles of law and order upon which the successful maintenance of free enterprise and the corporate activities of all stockholders depend."

INTERNAL REVENUE MOVES INTO CCG

The Bureau of Internal Revenue got wise to Rumely's fraud and ruled that CCG was not an educational institution and was, therefore, not entitled to a tax-exempt status and that contributions to it were not tax-exempt.

So the long-time conspirator, Rumely, figuring out another way to fleece Uncle Sam, came up with his ingenious device to make it profitable taxwise for the simple-minded fat cats to give their silly money to CCG. The amount involved in applying this device is not held to \$490; it is unlimited. The purchasers of the books and pamphlets donate the con-man Rumely's propaganda to churches and universities for distribution and thus enjoy an income-tax exemption based upon such donations.

Rumely makes all the arrangements and handles all the money although Sumner Gerard is officially the treasurer or agent. The fat cat gets his tax exemption, and hoaxed schools and churches distribute the malicious misinformation and half-truths to students, teachers, and church members. As an example of how this deceitful man operates, I quote from a letter sent out in the fall of 1947 by CCG:

"If you have not yet used up your 15-percent tax deductible allowance, or if your company has not yet used its 5 percent of net allowance for educational and philanthropic work, make a contribution to colleges to distribute this book. Presidents of schools have asked for 65,000 copies, which we will supply as soon as donors have been found. For this special purpose, make your check payable to Sumner Gerard, agent. Mr. Gerard will earmark and make the funds available to colleges for purchase of Norton books. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc."

Dresser's statement lifting the following quotations from my August 29 remarks, as inserted on September 18 by the gentleman from Michigan, is as follows:

Take the case of the wonderful friendship between Rumely and the crackpot anti-Semitic, self-admitted Fascist, Merwin K. Hart. Hart runs an equally violent propaganda outfit as the Committee for Constitutional Government—the National Economic Council. Frequently, Rumely and Hart have dinner together and discuss their mutual problems. I might add that they have mutual millionaire and big-business backers, including several members of the duPont family, Sears, Roebuck, Monsanto Chemical Co., John Rasch, William Volker & Co., Armco Steel Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Albert Hawkes, J. I. Case Co., Gen. Robert E. Wood, McCrory Stores, S. H.

Kress & Co., Republic Steel, and others. They do have a lot in common.

Not infrequently, Rumely's CCG sends out some of Hart's weird stuff.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee in the Seventy-ninth and Eighty-first Congresses, my investigators discovered how fraudulent were the National Small Businessmen's Association and the Small Business Economic Foundation, both run by one DeWitt Emery.

Now, it is a fact, that Rumely, Hart, Joe Kamp, DeWitt Emery, the NAM—all advocates of extreme reaction and/or actual fascism in America—team up whenever there is a job to do against the American people. These evil men and the antidemocratic groups they represent all work with one of the worst enemies of the people; Herb Nelson, executive vice president of and lobbyist for the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

The following quotations from my remarks of August 29 are pertinent to the afore-mentioned. Moreover, the hearings of the House Lobby Investigating Committee on Herb Nelson and the Real Estate Lobby, Merwin K. Hart, Joe Kamp, and Edward A. Rumely, recently printed in Government documents, give further ample proof of all allegations I made concerning the tie-up of these characters and their groups. I refer the Members of the House to those documents, which are now available.

Organizational connections have been maintained between Rumely and Hart through groups of which Hart was a member or of which he was cofounder with one or more of Rumely's stooges for his constitutional government set-up.

RUMELY, CCG, AND AMERICAN ACTION—FASCISTS ALL

Such a connection existed in American Action, whose cofounders were Hart and the Fascist-minded radio commentator, Upton Close. Sam Pettengill, one of Rumely's ex-lieutenants in CCG, was in at the beginning of American Action. Close's fascistic radio series was sponsored by the National Economic Council. His manager, Leo F. Reardon, was a former confidential adviser to Father Coughlin. Another strand in this web of fascism shows Thomas N. Creigh, former general counsel for the Cudahy Packing Houses, and head of the Chicago branch of Hart's National Economic Council, a founder of American Action. American Action financial supporters were Gen. Robert E. Woods, of Sears, Roebuck; Col. Robert R. McCormick, Ernest T. Weir, and you guessed it, Lamont du Pont.

Another organization in Rumely's black spider web of reaction is one I know about from personal experience. As chairman of the House Small Business Committee in the Seventy-ninth and Eighty-first Congresses, my investigators discovered how fraudulent were the National Small Businessmen's Association and the Small Business Economic Foundation, both run by one DeWitt Emery.

In a report issued by the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, it is disclosed that Emery was indiscreet enough to boast of his big-business backers, including United States Steel, Sears, Roebuck, Republic Steel, Chrysler Corp., Goodyear Tire & Rubber, American Rolling Mill Co., Inland Steel, and B. F. Goodrich, plus the big oil companies: Standard Oil of New Jersey, Standard Oil of Indiana, Socony-Vacuum, and the Texas Co. Emery was one of Rumely's hand servants in the formation of

American Action, Inc., where Rumely was represented directly through Samuel B. Pettengill.

Mr. Speaker, Dresser's statement as printed in the RECORD lifted from the context the following:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to present the sordid story of Ed Rumely, the convicted traitor. If all my words to this moment have been unconvincing, if everything I have said is dubbed a political smear, which it most certainly is not, what I am about to say and the documentary proof I am about to present should convince this august body that Ed Rumely deserves no more support than any of America's Judas Iscariots.

Some of you may say, "Well, he got a Presidential pardon from Coolidge," but, Mr. Speaker, that does not wipe the record clean.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my remarks I have called Ed Rumely an ex-convict. Before I finish, I promise to present the full story of how he was indicted, tried, and convicted of a most heinous crime, namely, violating the Trading With the Enemy Act in World War I.

Before I finish my remarks today, I shall call upon the Republican Members of this House to publicly denounce Ed Rumely, the notorious ex-convict—I will give details of his criminal past later in my remarks.

I reinsert my remarks pertinent to the aforementioned.

RUMELY, THE CONVICTED TRAITOR

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to present the sordid story of Ed Rumely, the convicted traitor. If all my words to this moment have been unconvincing, if everything I have said is dubbed a political smear, which it most certainly is not, what I am about to say and the documentary proof I am about to present should convince this august body that Ed Rumely deserves no more support than any of America's Judas Iscariots. Just as Judas turned against Christ, so did this man Rumely turn against his country in its time of great trial. You may discount, should your conscience permit, all of his fascistic activities since the formulation of his committee of black reaction, but you cannot discount the pertinent fact that this man was charged, tried, and convicted of trading with the enemy of the United States.

Some of you may say, "Well, he got a Presidential pardon from Coolidge," but, Mr. Speaker, that does not wipe the record clean. A thousand pardons cannot erase the fact that this subversive character, who deserves the affection and support of no man really interested in the welfare of his Nation, was charged, tried, and convicted of trading with the enemy even though his case went to the highest court in the land—the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Speaker, I will now tell the sordid story.

Edward A. Rumely was born in La Porte, Ind. He was of German descent and received strong Germanic home training. His early education in the United States was of the best, including attendance at Rensselaer College (Indiana) and 2½ years at Notre Dame. At the age of 18 he left for Europe to continue his education. He remained at Oxford, England, for over a year and then went to Germany. He studied at the University of Heidelberg for a year and then spent 3½ years at the University in Freiburg, where he took his degree in medicine in 1906. During his stay in Germany he made the acquaintance of many prominent German educators and industrialists. Being at an impressionable age, he became thor-

oughly indoctrinated with Germanic ideas with which he was daily in contact.

RUMELY WANTED TO FRUSTRANIZE AMERICAN YOUTH

Upon his return to the United States, Rumely had the urge to spread Germanic ideas in the United States. As a start, he founded the Interlaken School for Boys. The school's bulletin observed: "Dr. Rumely is carrying out in American form the soundest ideas of German education," and further remarked: "It is almost solely by the power of its new type of education that Germany has forged to the front in the last 25 years.

World War I soon came along and Rumely felt that the American press was not presenting the Kaiser's side of the war to the public. As Rumely himself expressed it: "There was a great deal of resentment against biased reports that were coming and that bias I had recognized was due to the absence of a news flow from the Central Powers." Rumely received \$200,000 from Dr. Heinrich F. Albert, the fiscal agent of the Imperial German Government, which was used for an advertisement in the foreign-language press of the United States. It was entitled "An Appeal to the American People" and was against furnishing aid to the Allies.

After extensive conferences with pro-German groups in the United States, including agents of the German Embassy, a much larger sum of the Kaiser's money—\$1,200,000—was also made available to Rumely for the purpose of purchasing a newspaper to disseminate pro-German propaganda to the American people. To avoid having the ownership of the newspaper—the New York Evening Mail—appear in the name of the German Government or in the name of an agent who was a German national, the transaction took the form of a loan to Rumely of funds which were used for the purchase of the paper.

Later, as I have indicated, Rumely was indicted, tried, and convicted of violating the Trading With the Enemy Act, and served a term in prison. Specifically, he was convicted of conspiring to defraud the United States by obstructing and preventing the United States from seizing the indebtedness which Rumely owed to the German Imperial Government and making false and misleading reports to the Alien Property Custodian by concealing the fact of such indebtedness.

THE COURT GIVES LIE TO RUMELY'S LIE

Rumely is no ordinary rabble-rouser, but is a shrewd and diabolical operator, sensitive to all phases of public relations work and the techniques of influencing public opinion. Like some of the political and economic prevarications that he has repeated through the years in the hope that repetition will result in belief, he has consistently maintained that he was not a German agent in World War I, knowing that public knowledge of such conduct would detract from the effect of his present propaganda work. Nevertheless, Rumely had a fair trial and was convicted by a jury of 12 of his fellow Americans. Rumely has denied, and continues to deny, the fairness of his trial. Here, in part, is what the United States circuit court of appeals had to say about his trial:

"The trial began on November 3, 1920, and occupied 30 court days. During the trial 166 witnesses were examined, 670 exhibits were received in evidence, and the record fills 4 volumes of 2,139 printed pages. There are 249 assignments of error, which occupy 116 printed pages. Of these assignments of error, 206 relate to the admission or exclusion of evidence, 24 to the charge to the jury, 7 to the denial of motions to set aside the verdict, 8 to the denial of motions to dismiss the indictment, and 3 to the denial of motions requiring the Government to elect on which counts it would go to trial. We have

on several occasions condemned the practice of taking so numerous assignments of error. The practice is not conducive to the administration of justice in appellate courts. Many such assignments of error are inconsequential, and of so little importance that the court should not be asked to review them.

"The omission of comment upon all the errors assigned must not be construed as due to the failure of the court to consider them. We have examined this case carefully, the indictment, the admission and exclusion of evidence, the charge of the court, and whatever errors have been assigned. We have found no sufficient reason, in any of the errors assigned, which would justify this court in setting the judgment aside. The defendants had a fair trial under a valid indictment. The jury has found them guilty, and we cannot say that there was no evidence which could justify the verdict which has been rendered.

"Judgment affirmed."

May I call to the attention of those who are interested in the pertinent parts of the court testimony, included in my remarks of August 29, which show why Rumely was convicted of trading with a foreign enemy—the German Imperial Government. Of course, Mr. Dresser would not be interested in this matter. I suggest that members of the Republican Party look up that testimony I presented because I am sure that they do not want to be linked in any way with one convicted of trading with an enemy of the United States.

In closing, I will repeat the lines of the poet Byron which I quoted in my remarks of August 29. They apply so very accurately to this man, Ed Rumely, as well as to those who are closely linked to him. Dresser would ignore these lines; as would Joe Kamp, Merwin K. Hart, and Edward A. Rumely. It was similar men of another day that Byron described in these words:

There is no traitor like him whose domestic treason plants the poinard within the heart which trusted to his truth.

EFFECT OF A PARDON

The courts have held that a pardon far from wiping out guilt the acceptance of an executive pardon may imply a conviction of guilt.

Rumely and his Fascist gang are trying to threaten the press as disclosed in a statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 15065 by the Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan. It is under the heading "Warning of libel" on that page. Incidentally, the statement about libel is not a correct statement. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has also told the House that a pardon relieves the punishment and blots out of existence the guilt of the offender to such an extent in the eye of the law he is as innocent as if he had never committed the offense. This is not according to the law as I read it.

OPINION OF AMERICAN LAW SECTION, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

At my request, a statement has been prepared by the American Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on the effect of an executive pardon. It is a very com-

prehensive statement and is inserted herewith:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington 25, D. C., September 20, 1950.
To: Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN.
From: American Law Section, Legislative
Reference Service.
Subject: Effect of an Executive pardon.

Your inquiry is whether or not the Legal Opinions appearing on page 15066 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 18, 1950, are correct. Insofar as these Legal Opinions (which consist with one exception of citations to American Jurisprudence and Corpus Juris) purport to demonstrate that a full executive pardon "blots out the existence of guilt" and restores the one pardoned to a state of complete innocence as if the offense had never occurred, they do not appear to be in accord—as a general proposition—with the more accepted view today as evidenced by authoritative decisions and commentators on the subject. We express no opinion, however, as to the reasons motivating the pardon involved in the discussion on pages 15065-15066 of the RECORD, supra, or as to the facts therein stated concerning the asserted innocence of the persons involved. In view of the limited time afforded for reply to your inquiry, we have confined this discussion to an examination of the general precedents, without attempting to state variations which may result in particular types of situations.

It is true that in *Ex parte Garland* ((1866) 71 U. S. 333), the Supreme Court made some very broad statements concerning the efficiency of a pardon to restore innocence. These statements have often been quoted generally in subsequent cases where a more precise statement was not necessary. See discussion in Williston, *Does a Pardon Blot Out Guilt?* ((1915) 28 Harv. L. Rev. 647); see, e. g., *Illinois Central R. Co. v. Bosworth* ((1890) 133 U. S. 92) and other cases cited in 39 Am. Jur., *Pardon, Reprieve and Amnesty*, section 51, note 15 (referred to in the "Legal Opinions" above); *Re Stephenson* ((1942) 243 Ala. 342, 10 So. (2d) 1); *State of Oklahoma ex rel. Cloud v. Election Board of State of Oklahoma* ((1934) 36 P. (2d) 20). And, admittedly, in a few jurisdictions these statements have been applied literally. See cases cited in *People v. Biggs* ((1937) 9 Cal. (2d) 508, 71 P. (2d) 214).

Nevertheless, the better view today seems to be that while a full pardon removes most of the legal consequences and disabilities of the offense and halts further punishment therefor, it does not bring to the pardoned man treatment equal in all respects to that accorded a person who has never committed the offense. In other words, an executive pardon does not erase the fact of a finding of guilt. In *re Spenser* ((C. C. D. Oreg. 1878) 22 Fed. Case No. 13,234); *People ex rel. Prisament v. Brophy* ((1941) 287 N. Y. 132, 38 N. E. (2d) 468, cert. den. 317 U. S. 625); *Lyons v. Goldstein* ((1943) 290 N. Y. 13, 47 N. E. (2d) 425); *People v. Biggs*, supra; *Boles v. Laws* ((C. App. D. C. 1930) 45 F. (2d) 669 (dictum that a pardon does not annul the act nor relieve from all consequences of it)); Williston, *op. cit.* supra; Humbert, *The Pardoning Power of the President* (1941) 76-79; Note ((1916) 4 Calif. L. Rev. 236). As stated in Note ((1913) 13 Col. L. Rev. 418), "The pardon * * * cannot obliterate the fact of the commission of the felony or of the moral guilt of the offender * * *." In Humbert, *op. cit.* supra, 77, the author, referring to *Ex parte Garland*, supra, said that the "Court's generalization that a pardon blots out guilt and makes the offender in the eye of the law 'as innocent as if he had never committed the offense' and 'makes him, as it were, a new man' is not only false but also contrary to early English precedents from which the generalization is derived." Similarly, in *In re Spenser*, supra, the court, after

quoting from the *Garland* case, said: "I do not suppose the opinion is to be understood as going to the length of holding that while the party is to be deemed innocent of the crime by reason of the pardon from and after the taking effect thereof, that it is also to be deemed that he never did commit the crime or was convicted of it. The effect of the pardon is prospective and not retrospective * * *. But it does not change the past and cannot annihilate the established fact that he was guilty of the offense." After examining English authorities the court further said: "From these authorities it is plain that a pardon does not operate retrospectively. The offender is purged of his guilt, and thenceforth he is an innocent man; but the past is not obliterated nor the fact that he had committed the crime wiped out."

Some decisions of the Supreme Court since *Ex parte Garland* also indicate that this is the correct view. (Humbert, *op. cit.* supra, 76-79.) See *Bradford v. U. S.* ((1913) 223 U. S. 446), and particularly *Burdick v. U. S.* ((1915) 236 U. S. 79), where it was stated by the Court that one to whom a pardon is offered may reject "escape by confession of guilt implied in the acceptance of a pardon * * * preferring to be the victim of the law rather than its acknowledged transgressor—preferring death even to such certain infamy." The Court, in discussing the distinctions between legislative immunity and a pardon, also said:

"The latter carries an imputation of guilt; acceptance a confession of it. The former has no such imputation or confession. It is tantamount to the silence of the witness. It is noncommittal. It is the unobtrusive act of the law giving protection against a sinister use of his testimony, not like a pardon requiring him to confess his guilt in order to avoid a conviction of it."

Supporting this analysis of the general problem are statements from some leading State cases. In *People v. Biggs*, supra, the Supreme Court of California declared:

"Appellant relies largely upon a number of declarations by various authorities as to the general effect of a pardon. The following are examples: 'The power to pardon is something more than the power to release from servitude. "Pardon" is the remission of guilt, amnesty, oblivion, or forgetfulness.' *People v. Hale* (64 Cal. App. 523, 533, 222 p. 148, 152). 'The effect of a pardon (under the rules of the common law) is to make the offender a new man; to acquit him of all corporal penalties and forfeitures annexed to that offense for which he obtains a pardon; it gives him a new credit and capacity.' *People v. Bowen* (43 Cal. 439, 442, 13 Am. Rep. 148), quoting from Blackstone's Commentaries. 'A pardon reaches both the punishment prescribed for the offense and the guilt of the offender; and when the pardon is full, it releases the punishment and blots out of existence the guilt, so that in the eye of the law the offender is as innocent as if he had never committed the offense. * * * If granted after conviction, it removes the penalties and disabilities, and restores him to all his civil rights; it makes him, as it were, a new man, and gives him a new credit and capacity.' *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333, 380, 18 L. Ed. 366). Similar expressions may be found in numerous other cases.

"But the somewhat extravagant language occasionally employed must be contrasted with the actual decisions of the courts. It is universally established that a pardon exempts the individual from the punishment which the law inflicts for the crime which he has committed; and generally speaking, it also removes any disqualifications or disabilities which would ordinarily have followed from the conviction. To say, however, that the offender is 'a new man,' and 'as innocent as if he had never committed

the offense,' is to ignore the difference between the crime and the criminal. A person adjudged guilty of an offense is a convicted criminal, though pardoned; he may be deserving of punishment, though left unpunished; and the law may regard him as more dangerous to society than one never found guilty of crime, though it place no restraints upon him following his conviction. The criminal character or habits of the individual, the chief postulate of habitual criminal statutes, is often as clearly disclosed by a pardoned conviction as by one never condoned. The broad generalizations quoted above are, if taken too literally, logically unsound as well as historically questionable."

Likewise, in *People ex rel. Prisament v. Brophy*, supra, the New York Court of Appeals, after referring to *Ex parte Garland*, stated:

"Literally, of course, an executive pardon cannot blot out of existence the guilt of one who committed a crime. At most it can wipe out the legal consequences which flow from an adjudication of guilt. In *Ex parte Garland*, supra, the court gave to the Presidential pardon no greater effect. The court decided only that 'the effect of this pardon is to relieve the petitioner from all penalties and disabilities attached to the offense of treason, committed by his participation in the rebellion. So far as that offense is concerned, he is thus placed beyond the reach of punishment of any kind' (4 Wall. 381). To illuminate a decision in which a bare majority of the court concurred and which was rendered while the passions roused by the rebellion still clouded the judgment of most citizens, the court used, appropriately enough, a metaphor; but metaphors cannot appropriately be used to justify a conclusion which would follow logically only if the metaphor were not a figure of speech but an accurate description. The logical difficulties which must follow if the metaphor used by the court in *Ex parte Garland* were accepted as a premise from which legal consequences inexorably follow are made manifest by what was said and decided by the court in *Matter of —*, an attorney, 86 N. Y. 563, especially at page 569.

"The Supreme Court of the United States, indeed, has itself rejected the implications lurking in the metaphor it used in *Ex parte Garland*. In *Burdick v. United States* (263 U. S. 79, 90; 35 S. Ct. 267, 269; 59 L. Ed. 476), the Court pointed out that, far from wiping out guilt, the acceptance of an executive pardon may imply a confession of guilt."

Further, in *Lyons v. Goldstein*, supra, the New York Court of Appeals also pointed out:

"Executive clemency does not eliminate the fact of conviction; it merely results in ending further punishment * * *. A pardon proceeds, not upon the theory of innocence, but implies guilt. If there was no guilt, theoretically at least, there would be no basis for pardon. It is granted, not as matter of right, but of grace * * *. A party is acquitted on the ground of innocence. He is pardoned through favor * * *. If the judgment was erroneous, the remedy was by appeal or by application to set it aside, and not by pardon."

Moreover, in *Knote v. U. S.* ((1878) 95 U. S. 149), the Supreme Court pointed out that a pardon cannot make amends for the past and undo what has been done. And, if character of a stated kind is a necessary qualification for some post or office, the fact that an individual has been convicted of a crime and then pardoned does not necessarily make him eligible. Williston, *op. cit.* supra; note ((1916) 4 Calif. L. Rev. 236) (a pardon "does not restore the ex-convict to a state of innocence nor in any way represent that he is as honest, reliable, and upright as if he had constantly maintained the character of a law-abiding citizen"). As

stated in *State ex rel. Attorney General v. Hawkins* ((1886) 44 Ohio State 98, 5 N. E. 228):

"Whatever the theory of the law may be as to the effect of a pardon, it cannot work such moral changes as to warrant the assertion that a pardoned convict is just as reliable as one who has constantly maintained the character of a good citizen."

It may be noted also that the Legal Opinions here under consideration in three instances cite statements purporting to demonstrate that one who is pardoned may bring an action for libel or slander against one who refers to such offense as having been committed by the person pardoned. Without attempting any analysis of the law of libel and slander in this respect in the limited time afforded for reply to your inquiry, it may be observed that in 33 American Jurisprudence, Libel and Slander, section 16, cited in the Legal Opinions as authority for this view, the sole case there cited is referred to in the following manner: *Shipp v. McCraw* (7 N. C. (3 Murph.) 463, 9 Am. Dec. 611 (discussed, not decided)). The second reference in the Legal Opinions is to 39 American Jurisprudence, Pardon, Reprieve, and Amnesty, section 51, wherein the sole supporting case cited is *People v. Bowen* (43 Cal. 439, 13 Am. Rep. 148). As the above quotation from *People v. Biggs*, supra, demonstrates, this California case is one which the California Supreme Court later described as using somewhat extravagant language which the court in effect repudiated. The third reference is to 36 Corpus Juris, page 1196, section 106, wherein the supporting cases cited are *Shipp v. McCraw*, supra, and two English cases which we have not had an opportunity to examine.

ROBERT S. OGLEBAY,
American Law Section.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1950.

WHAT CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL SAID ABOUT PARDON

In the case of the *United States v. Wilson* (7 Pet. U. S. 150, 160 (1833)), Chief Justice Marshall said:

A pardon is a deed, to the validity of which delivery is essential and delivery is not complete without acceptance. It may then be rejected by the person to whom it is tendered and if it be rejected we have discovered no power in the Court to force it on him.

INCREASED INTEREST RATES OPPOSED

Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time my statement, which was released to the press on Monday, September 18, 1950, with reference to the recent actions of the Federal Reserve System and its open-market committee. It is as follows:

I have been deeply interested in the recent actions of the Federal Reserve System and its open-market committee, as high-lighted in recent news stories. Since the Federal Reserve System is a creature of the Congress, it becomes incumbent upon the Congress to familiarize itself with Federal Reserve policies and their effects upon managing the Federal debt and the operations of the Federal Government generally.

I understand that the Treasury's current \$13,570,000,000 refunding of debt on a 1½ percent interest basis is in effect being refinanced at a higher actual rate to the taxpayers. It is reported that the Federal Reserve System is sustaining a loss in its open-market operations. This reduces the profit of the Federal Reserve System which normally is turned into the Treasury's general fund.

What has been the effect of this moderate action on the part of the Federal Reserve System? Has it helped to control inflation? What has been the price in terms of the cost

of servicing our Federal debt of over \$250,000,000,000? A rise of a full percentage point in interest rates involves an increase of \$2,500,000,000 in the annual Federal budget. Even the relatively small increase in interest rates that has occurred in the last 5 years has been said to contribute substantially toward increasing the interest obligations of the Government by nearly a billion dollars a year, despite the fact that the total Federal debt is somewhat lower than in 1945. How much further should interest rates be allowed to rise, or should they be reduced?

Such are the questions that led me to ask the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to make an intensive examination of recent happenings in the short-term money market. The staff has been asked to present the facts with respect to recent changes in interest rates and especially their effects on business borrowing, commercial credit, costs of Government borrowing and inflation generally. Upon completion of the staff report this fall, members of the committee will decide whether or not hearings should be held and committee action taken.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

OUR BEST DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in this time of strife it is imperative that we look for moral guidance in the teachings of Christ. Our Nation was built on the faith of our founding fathers. Because of their reliance upon our Creator in meeting the problems which confronted them we are today a leader in the world. If we expect to continue as a great nation and the builders of peace we must look to our morals. Our only future lies in our spiritual wisdom.

Our best defense against communism is Christianity but we cannot achieve this with a willing spirit but weak hands. Surface cheerfulness alone is no effective defense against human problems. Something more substantial is needed. We have prized our religious heritage and it is necessary that we do not now neglect our moral goals or we will be faced with disintegration.

We must take our lessons from history and build our spiritual fences at home; in our family life and in our every day life. We would not now be faced with atom destruction of the world if every person had Christ in his life. We would have no fear of war or international problems if we had Christ in our hearts. Instead we would be thinking I am my brother's keeper. Under these conditions communism could not exist.

Culture and a high standard of living is not enough. These have existed with other nations that have fallen before the sword. Our right to vote would be of no avail if we do not have high Christian morals to live by. Democracy is an empty form of government if Christ is not in it. Without Christianity it is impossible to make democracy live.

I give to all Americans this little poem for a creed:

MYSELF

I have to live with myself, and so
I want to be fit for myself to know;
I want to be able as the days go by
Always to look myself in the eye.
I don't want to stand with the setting sun
And hate myself for the things I've done.
I want to go out with my head erect;

I want to deserve every man's respect.
But here in the struggle for fame and self
I want to be able to like myself.
I don't want to look at myself and know
That I'm bluster and bluff and empty show,
I never can hide myself from me
I see what others may never see;
I know what others may never know.
I never can fool myself, and so
Whatever happens, I want to be
Self-respecting and conscience-free.
And I hope you'll live your whole life through
The way I really wish to do;
So under the Blood of Christ I'll live
And He will grace and wisdom give.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

SPAIN PRESSURES UNITED STATES OLIVE OIL IMPORTERS AND CONSUMERS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in June and July of this year American importers had contracted for 17,000 tons of olive oil from the new Spanish crop for \$460 a ton.

These were contingent upon the issuance of export licenses by the Spanish Government.

As these licenses had never been held up before, some importers made contracts for future delivery in the United States.

Then, without fair warning, the dollar diplomats at Madrid announced on Monday, September 11, that no export licenses would be issued unless the price was jumped from \$460 to \$650 a ton, or a whopping increase of 41 percent.

It appears that the Spanish Government believes in leapfrog inflation, instead of the creeping variety. But the shock to American importers is one from which they may not recover unless the Spanish Government revises its drastic order. A gradual increase in the price of olive oil to which the contracting parties could adjust their purchases would seem to be the legitimate way of meeting this economic problem.

American importers freely admit that some increase was justified, since the price originally agreed upon for the Spanish crop was considerably below the prevailing prices paid for the same commodity in Italy and Tunisia. They also recognize that contracts between exporters and importers are conditional for their fulfillment upon the issuance of export licenses.

But a 41-percent hike, and jet-propelled, is something for which they were not prepared, and to which they cannot adjust themselves without a serious financial set-back.

They just cannot do business on such an explosive basis.

There are thousands of people in my district—and millions throughout the Nation—to whom olive oil is as essential in the preparation of a meal as butter is to others. Of an estimated United States consumption of 30,000 tons a year, more than half comes from Spain.

Price pressures within the American economy, as it changes to a semiwartime footing, have edged the cost of living up by a few percentage points, putting the squeeze on many family budgets.

You can imagine what would happen if the price of a necessity went up 41 per-